

ON THE STRENGTH OF HAUSDORFF'S GAP CONDITION

JAMES HIRSCHORN

ABSTRACT. Hausdorff's gap condition was satisfied by his original 1936 construction of an (ω_1, ω_1) gap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$. We solve an open problem in determining whether Hausdorff's condition is actually stronger than the more modern indestructibility condition, by constructing an indestructible (ω_1, ω_1) gap not equivalent to any gap satisfying Hausdorff's condition, from uncountably many random reals.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *pregap* in a Boolean algebra $(\mathcal{B}, \leq)$ is an orthogonal pair (A, B) of subsets of $\mathcal{B}$, i.e.

- (i) $a \cdot b = 0$ for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$,

and it is a *gap* if additionally there is no element c of $\mathcal{B}$ such that

- (ii) $a < c$ for all $a \in A$, and $b < -c$ for all $b \in B$.

Such an element c is said to *interpolate* the pregap. A *linear pregap* is a pregap (A, B) where both A and B are linearly ordered by $\leq$, and for a pair of linear order types (φ, ψ) , a (φ, ψ) *pregap* in a Boolean algebra $(\mathcal{B}, \leq)$ is a linear pregap (A, B) where $\text{otp}(A, \leq) = \varphi$ and $\text{otp}(B, \leq) = \psi$. Thus (A, B) is a (φ, ψ) *gap* if it is a (φ, ψ) pregap for which no element of $\mathcal{B}$ can be used to extend (A, B) to a $(\varphi + 1, \psi)$ pregap or a $(\varphi, \psi + 1)$ pregap.

Gaps in the Boolean algebra $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}, \subseteq^*)$ have a long history with some basic results appearing as early as 1873, including Hadamard's theorem [Had94] that there are no (δ, δ) gaps in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ for any ordinal δ with countable cofinality. Indeed, one of the major achievements in early Set Theory was Hausdorff's construction [Hau36] in 1936 of an (ω_1, ω_1) gap.

While being a pregap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ is absolute for transitive models, the property of being a gap is not. For example, if (A, B) is an (ω_1, ω_1) gap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ is a poset which collapses ω_1 , then by Hadamard's theorem forcing with $\mathcal{Q}$ must introduce an element of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ which interpolates (A, B) and thus renders it a non-gap. Avoiding this particular example, an (ω_1, ω_1) pregap (A, B) in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ is called *destructible* if there is an ω_1 -preserving poset which forces that (A, B) is not a gap.

Destructibility is in fact a Ramsey theoretic phenomenon. This becomes clear when one considers the characterization of destructibility below (Lemma 1). When working with pregaps in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ one often works with representatives (i.e. subsets of $\mathbb{N}$) of the equivalence classes. In this case, whenever $a_\alpha, b_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ ($\alpha < \delta$) is a (δ, δ) pregap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ for some ordinal δ , we may assume—in order to avoid trivialities and thereby obtain more concise results—that the representatives have been chosen so that

$$(1) \quad a_\alpha \cap b_\alpha = \emptyset \quad \text{for all } \alpha < \delta.$$

Date: September 21, 2002.

Research supported by Lise Meitner Fellowship, Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung (FWF).

We also assume that the enumerations respect the well orderings of both $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$ and $\{b_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$ by $\subset^*$.

Given a pregap $(a_\alpha, b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$, define a partition of $[\omega_1]^2 = K_0 \cup K_1$ by

$$(2) \quad \{\alpha, \beta\} \in K_0 \quad \text{iff} \quad (a_\alpha \cap b_\beta) \cup (a_\beta \cap b_\alpha) = \emptyset.$$

Lemma 1. *For every (ω_1, ω_1) pregap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ the following are equivalent:*

- (a) $(a_\alpha, b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ is destructible.
- (b) There is no uncountable 1-homogeneous subset of ω_1 .
- (c) There exists a poset with the ccc forcing that $(a_\alpha, b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ is not a gap.

Proof. See [Sch93]. □

The existence of destructible (ω_1, ω_1) gaps in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ is independent of the usual axioms of mathematics (ZFC). For example, it is a theorem of Kunen [Kun76] that $\text{MA}_{\aleph_1}$ implies that all (ω_1, ω_1) gaps are indestructible, while theorems of Todorćević are that a destructible (ω_1, ω_1) gap can be constructed from either a diamond sequence or a Cohen real (see [Dow95], [TF95], resp.).

The existence of indestructible (ω_1, ω_1) gaps can be proved from the usual axioms of mathematics. Indeed the gap originally constructed by Hausdorff was indestructible, and in fact satisfied an even stronger condition:

$$(3) \quad \{\alpha < \beta : a_\alpha \cap b_\beta \setminus k = \emptyset\} \text{ is finite} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ for all } \beta < \omega_1.$$

Hausdorff's condition is strictly stronger than indestructibility because one can always modify the initial parts $(a_\alpha, b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega + 1)$ of an indestructible gap to make (3) fail. However, the following definition is clearly a correct description of the equivalence of two gap structures.

Definition 2. Two gaps (A, B) and (A', B') in some Boolean algebra $(\mathcal{B}, \leq)$ are *equivalent* if A is $\leq$ -cofinal in A' , A' is $\leq$ -cofinal in A , B is $\leq$ -cofinal in B' and B' is $\leq$ -cofinal in B .

For example, if (A, B) is an (ω_1, ω_1) pregap in some Boolean algebra then for any uncountable $A' \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq B$, (A', B') is equivalent to the original pregap.

Hausdorff's condition is not just of historical interest. In some contexts it is a more natural condition than indestructibility. For example, as shown in [AT97], (*)—a combinatorial principle for P -ideals of countable sets which is compatible with CH—implies that all (ω_1, ω_1) gaps in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ are indestructible because for a given (ω_1, ω_1) gap $(a_\alpha, b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ the ideal of all countable subsets Ω of ω_1 on which $(a_\alpha, b_\alpha : \alpha \in \Omega)$ satisfies Hausdorff's condition forms a P -ideal, and applying (*) to this P -ideal establishes that (A, B) is equivalent with a gap satisfying Hausdorff's condition.

Scheepers in [Sch93] and [Sch96] has asked whether indestructibility is as strong as Hausdorff's condition.

Question (Scheepers). *Is every indestructible (ω_1, ω_1) gap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ equivalent with an (ω_1, ω_1) gap satisfying Hausdorff's condition?*

We give a negative answer (i.e. we show that the statement in Question is consistently false).

Theorem. *If $\mathcal{R}$ is a nonseparable measurable algebra, then with positive probability, there exists an indestructible (ω_1, ω_1) gap in $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}, \subseteq^*)$ which is not equivalent to any (ω_1, ω_1) gap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ satisfying Hausdorff's condition.*

This can be put in a different setting. It is a corollary that the classical hypothesis that the Lebesgue measure can be extended to all subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ distinguishes

between indestructibility and Hausdorff's condition. This is an immediate consequence of the Theorem and known absoluteness results for forcing extensions by a large enough measure algebra, from a real-valued measurable cardinal of size at most continuum (see [TF95]).

Corollary 3. *If the Lebesgue measure on the real line can be extended to a measure whose domain is all of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, then there exists a indestructible (ω_1, ω_1) gap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ which is not equivalent to any gap satisfying Hausdorff's condition.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mu : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a measure extending the Lebesgue measure, and let $\mathcal{N}_\mu$ be the ideal of all subsets $N \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $\mu(N) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a generic filter over V of the poset $(\mathcal{Q}, \subseteq)$ where $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \mathcal{N}_\mu$. Since

$$(4) \quad (V, \in, \mathcal{G}) \models \ulcorner \mathcal{G} \text{ is a } \sigma\text{-complete ultrafilter on } \mathbb{R} \urcorner,$$

in $V[\mathcal{G}]$, the ultrapower $\text{Ult}(V, \mathcal{G}) = (V^{\mathbb{R} \cap V} \cap V) / \mathcal{G}$ ($f, g \in V^{\mathbb{R} \cap V} \cap V$ are equivalent if $\{r \in \mathbb{R} \cap V : f(r) = g(r)\} \in \mathcal{G}$) with its ordering $\in^{\mathbb{R}} / \mathcal{G}$ (i.e. $\{r : f(r) \in g(r)\} \in \mathcal{G}$) is well-founded, and thus there is an elementary embedding

$$(5) \quad j : V \rightarrow M \cong \text{Ult}(V, \mathcal{G})$$

where M is the transitive (Mostowski) collapse of the ultrapower.

Arguing in V : Note that for every $\mathcal{Q}$ -name $\dot{f}$ for a member of $(V^{\mathbb{R}})^\check{} there is a $g_{\dot{f}} \in V^{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\mathcal{Q} \Vdash [\dot{f}] = [\dot{g}_{\dot{f}}]$ (where $[f]$ denotes the equivalence class of f in $\text{Ult}(V, \mathcal{G})$). Suppose that $\{\dot{f} : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a family of cardinality less than $\text{add}(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$ of $\mathcal{Q}$ -names for members of $(V^{\mathbb{R}})^\check{} Defining $G \in V^{\mathbb{R}}$ by $G(r) = \{g_{\dot{f}}(r) : \dot{f} \in \mathcal{F}\}$, for every $\dot{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{Q} \Vdash [\dot{f}] \in^{\mathbb{R}} / \dot{\mathcal{G}} [\check{G}]$ since $\{r \in \mathbb{R} : g_{\dot{f}}(r) \notin G(r)\} = \emptyset \in \mathcal{N}_\mu$; and conversely, if $A \in \mathcal{Q}$ forces that $[\dot{h}] \neq [\dot{f}]$ for all $\dot{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\mu(\{r \in A : g_{\dot{h}}(r) = g_{\dot{f}}(r)\}) = 0$ for all $\dot{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, and thus $\mu(\{r \in A : g_{\dot{h}}(r) \in G(r)\}) = 0$ since $|\mathcal{F}| < \text{add}(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$, and therefore $A \Vdash [\dot{h}] \notin^{\mathbb{R}} / \dot{\mathcal{G}} [\check{G}]$. This proves that$$

$$(6) \quad [M]^{<\text{add}(\mathcal{N}_\mu)^V} \subseteq M.$$

Forcing with $\mathcal{Q}$ is the same as forcing with $\mathcal{R}^+$ where $(\mathcal{R}, \nu)$ is the measure algebra of the measure space $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}), \mu)$, i.e. $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) / \mathcal{N}_\mu$ and $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \mathcal{N}_\mu \mapsto [A] \in \mathcal{R}^+$ is a surjective embedding. By considering if necessary a homogeneous principle ideal $\mathcal{R}_z = \{x \in \mathcal{R} : x \leq z\}$ ($z \in \mathcal{R}^+$) of $\mathcal{R}$, Maharam's theorem states that the probability algebra $(\mathcal{R}_z, \mu_z)$, where $\mu_z(x) = \mu(x) / \mu(z)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{R}_z$, is isomorphic (as a measure algebra) to the measure algebra of $\{0, 1\}^\theta$ with its Haar probability measure, where θ is either 0 or an infinite cardinal and is called the *Maharam type* of $\mathcal{R}_z$ (see [Fre01]). In other words, $\mathcal{R}_z^+$ is isomorphic to the canonical poset for adding θ random reals. It is a theorem of Gitik and Shelah [GS01] that the measure algebra of a measure space with domain $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ has Maharam type $2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$. In particular, $\mathcal{R}$ is nonseparable, and therefore by the Theorem, there is an $A \in \mathcal{Q}$ forcing the existence of an indestructible (ω_1, ω_1) gap (A, B) in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ which is not equivalent to any gap satisfying Hausdorff's condition. Assume that $A \in \mathcal{G}$.

It is a classical theorem of Ulam that $\text{add}(\mathcal{N}_\mu) \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ is at least as large as the smallest weakly inaccessible cardinal, and in particular (6) implies that, in $V[\mathcal{G}]$, $H_{\aleph_2} \subseteq M$. Since (ω_1, ω_1) pregaps in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ are objects of $H_{\aleph_2}$, by elementarity there exists in V such a gap. $\square$

Remark 4. It follows from some of the proofs in [Hir01] that, assuming $\text{MA}_{\aleph_1}$, in the extension by a separable measurable algebra, every (ω_1, ω_1) gap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$ is equivalent to a Hausdorff gap. Thus the construction is not possible with only one random real.

2. CONSTRUCTION

2.1. Measure theoretic characterization. We have the following simple necessary condition for the Hausdorff property of an $\mathcal{R}$ -name for pregap.

Lemma 5. *Let $(\mathcal{R}, \mu)$ be a probability algebra and let $(\dot{a}_\alpha, \dot{b}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ be an $\mathcal{R}$ -name for an (ω_1, ω_1) pregap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$. If for some $h \in c_0$,*

$$(7) \quad \mu(\|\dot{a}_\alpha \cap \dot{b}_\beta \setminus k \neq \emptyset\|) \leq h(k)$$

for all $\alpha, \beta < \omega_1$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then with probability one, $(\dot{a}_\alpha, \dot{b}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ is not equivalent to any gap satisfying Hausdorff's condition.

Proof. First note that if $(a_\alpha, b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ is an (ω_1, ω_1) pregap in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) / \text{Fin}$, and $(a'_\alpha, b'_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ is an equivalent pregap, then there must be an uncountable $X \subseteq \omega_1$, $\alpha_\xi \geq \xi$ for all $\xi \in X$ and an integer l such that $a'_\xi \setminus l \subseteq a_{\alpha_\xi}$ and $b'_\xi \setminus l \subseteq b_{\alpha_\xi}$ for all $\xi \in X$. Let $X_0 \subseteq X$ be uncountable where the sequence α_ξ ($\xi \in X$) is strictly increasing on X_0 . Then if $(a'_\alpha, b'_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ satisfies Hausdorff's condition, so does $(a_{\alpha_\xi}, b_{\alpha_\xi} : \xi \in X_0)$.

Suppose then that $\dot{Y}$ is an $\mathcal{R}$ -name for an uncountable subset of ω_1 , and that $x \in \mathcal{R}^+$ forces that $(\dot{a}_\alpha, \dot{b}_\alpha : \alpha \in \dot{Y})$ has Hausdorff's property. Then there is a $\delta > 0$ and an uncountable $X \subseteq \omega_1$ such that

$$(8) \quad \mu(x \cdot \|\alpha \in \dot{Y}\|) > \delta \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in X.$$

Thus by Gillis' Theorem [Gil36] there is an uncountable $X_0 \subseteq X$ such that

$$(9) \quad \mu(x \cdot \|\alpha \in \dot{Y}\| \cdot \|\beta \in \dot{Y}\|) > \delta^2 \quad \text{for all } \alpha, \beta \in X_0.$$

Let k be large enough so that $h(k) \leq \delta^2 / 2$. Pick $\beta \in X_0$ so that $X_0 \cap \beta$ is infinite. Since $x \cdot \|\beta \in \dot{Y}\|$ forces that there are only finitely many $\alpha \in \dot{Y} \cap \beta$ such that $\dot{a}_\alpha \cap \dot{b}_\beta \setminus k = \emptyset$, there is an $\bar{\alpha} \in X_0 \cap \beta$ such that

$$(10) \quad \mu(x \cdot \|\bar{\alpha} \in \dot{Y}\| \cdot \|\beta \in \dot{Y}\| \cdot \|\dot{a}_{\bar{\alpha}} \cap \dot{b}_\beta \setminus k = \emptyset\|) < \frac{\delta^2}{2}.$$

Combining (9) and (10) yields $\mu(\|\dot{a}_{\bar{\alpha}} \cap \dot{b}_\beta \setminus k \neq \emptyset\|) > \delta^2 / 2 \geq h(k)$. $\square$

2.2. Notation. We denote the set of all finite partial functions from X into Y by $\text{Fin}(X, Y)$. *Logical and* (digitwise base 2) is denoted by ' $\wedge$ ' and *exclusive or* is denoted by ' $\vee$ ' (e.g. for $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, $i \vee j = 0$ if $i = j$, and $i \vee j = 1$ if $i \neq j$). Define a mapping $w : \omega_1 \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \text{Fin}(\omega_1, \{0, 1\})$ where $\text{dom}(w(\alpha, i, j)) = [\alpha, \alpha + i]$ and

$$(11) \quad w(\alpha, i, j)(\alpha + k) = \frac{j \bmod 2^i}{2^k} \wedge 1 \quad \text{for all } k < i,$$

in other words, the concatenation

$$(12) \quad w(\alpha, i, j)(\alpha + i - 1)w(\alpha, i, j)(\alpha + i - 2) \cdots w(\alpha, i, j)(\alpha)$$

is the base 2 representation of $j \bmod 2^i$.

For a set X , we write $(\mathcal{R}_{(X)}, \mu_{(X)})$ for the measure algebra of the space $\{0, 1\}^X$ with its Haar probability measure. And for a finite partial function $s : X \dashrightarrow \{0, 1\}$, we let $[s]_{(X)} \in \mathcal{R}_{(X)}$ be the equivalence class of the measurable set

$$\{z \in \{0, 1\}^X : z \supseteq s\}.$$

Sets of this form are called *basic elements* of $\mathcal{R}_{(X)}$. It will be convenient to be able to denote $0 \in \mathcal{R}_{(X)}$ with the $[s]_{(X)}$ notation, and thus we adopt the extension where

$$(13) \quad [(-1)]_{(X)} = 0.$$

2.3. Proof of Theorem. Define $g, h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by $g(n) = 0 \cdot 2^0 + 1 \cdot 2^1 + \dots + n \cdot 2^n$, and

$$(14) \quad h(m) = \min_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m < g(n).$$

The Theorem is proved by constructing an $\mathcal{R}_{(\omega_1)}$ -name $(\dot{a}_\alpha, \dot{b}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ for a pregap such that

$$(15) \quad \|\dot{a}_\alpha \cap \dot{b}_\alpha = \emptyset\| = 1 \quad \text{for all } \alpha,$$

$$(16) \quad \|\dot{a}_\alpha \cap \dot{b}_\beta \neq \emptyset\| = 1 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \neq \beta,$$

$$(17) \quad \mu_{(\omega_1)}(\|m \in \dot{a}_\alpha \cap \dot{b}_\beta\|) \leq 2^{-2h(m)} \quad \text{for all } m, \text{ for all } \alpha, \beta.$$

Then by conditions (15) and (16) and Lemma 1, $(\dot{a}_\alpha, \dot{b}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ is an indestructible (ω_1, ω_1) gap with probability one, and since $m \mapsto 2^{-2h(m)} \in \ell_1$, by condition (17) and applying Lemma 5 to $k \mapsto \sum_{m=k}^\infty 2^{-2h(m)} \in c_0$, with probability one it is not equivalent to a Hausdorff gap.

Suppose we are given a measurable algebra $\mathcal{R}$ with probability measure μ . Assuming $\mathcal{R}$ is nonseparable, i.e. the measure algebra topology on $\mathcal{R}$ induced by μ is nonseparable, by Maharam's Theorem there is a measure algebra embedding of $(\mathcal{R}_{(\omega_1)}, \mu_{(\omega_1)})$ into some principal ideal $(\mathcal{R}_z, \mu_z)$ ($z \in \mathcal{R}^+$, $\mu_z(x) = \mu(x) / \mu(z)$ for $x \in \mathcal{R}_z$) of $\mathcal{R}$. Thus, forcing over the poset $\mathcal{R}^+$, z forces that there exists an indestructible (ω_1, ω_1) gap not equivalent to any Hausdorff gap, completing the proof of the Theorem.

Since an $\mathcal{R}_{(\omega_1)}$ -name for an (ω_1, ω_1) pregap satisfying (15), (16) and (17) can clearly be expressed in the language $\mathcal{L}_\omega(Q)$, we may use forcing with an ω_1 -preserving poset to perform the construction. I.e. if the existence of such an object is consistent then by Keisler's Completeness Theorem for $\mathcal{L}_\omega(Q)$ [Kei70] it does exist. Indeed we are not aware of how to do the construction differently, e.g. by recursion on $\alpha < \omega_1$.

The following observation is used to satisfy (16): For every $n \geq 1$, whenever $[\alpha, \alpha + n) \cap [\beta, \beta + n) = \emptyset$,

$$(18) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{2^i-1} [w(\alpha, i, j) \cup w(\beta, i, j \vee 2^{i-1})] + \sum_{j=0}^{2^n-1} [w(\alpha, n, j) \cup w(\beta, n, j)] = 1.$$

Define $\langle \rangle : (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by

$$(19) \quad \langle i, j, k \rangle = g(i-1) + ji + k.$$

Note that $h(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$, for all $j < 2^i$, for all $k < i$. For the remainder we write μ for $\mu_{(\omega_1)}$.

Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the poset of all conditions $(\Omega_p, \{s_p^\alpha, t_p^\alpha : \alpha \in \Omega_p\})$ where

- (a) $\Omega_p \subseteq \text{Lim}(\omega_1)$ is finite,
- (b) for some $n_p \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $\alpha \in \Omega_p$,

$$s_p^\alpha, t_p^\alpha : g(n_p) \rightarrow \{\langle -1 \rangle\} \cup \bigcup_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lim}(\omega_1) \\ \gamma \leq \alpha}} \text{Fin}([\gamma, \gamma + \omega), \{0, 1\}),$$

- (c) $n_p \geq |\Omega_p|$,
- (d) for all $i = 1, \dots, n_p$, for all $j < 2^i$, for all $k < i$, $\mu([s_p^\alpha(\langle i, j, k \rangle)]) \leq 2^{-i}$ and $\mu([t_p^\alpha(\langle i, j, k \rangle)]) \leq 2^{-i}$,
- (e) for all $\alpha \in \Omega_p$, and all i, j , there exists $k < i$ such that $s_p^\alpha(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = w(\alpha, i, j)$ and $t_p^\alpha(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = w(\alpha, i, j \vee 2^{i-1})$,
- (f) for all $m < g(n_p)$, $[s_p^\alpha(m)] \cdot [t_p^\alpha(m)] = 0$,
- (g) for all α, β in Ω_p , for all i, j, k , $\mu([s_p^\alpha(\langle i, j, k \rangle)] \cdot [t_p^\beta(\langle i, j, k \rangle)]) \leq 2^{-2i}$,

- (h) for all $\alpha \neq \beta$ in Ω_p , there exists $E_{\alpha\beta} \subseteq g(n_p)$ such that
- (i) $s_p^\alpha(m) \in \text{Fin}([\alpha, \alpha + \omega), \{0, 1\})$ for all $m \in E_{\alpha\beta}$,
 - (ii) $t_p^\beta(m) \in \text{Fin}([\beta, \beta + \omega), \{0, 1\})$ for all $m \in E_{\alpha\beta}$,
 - (iii) $\sum_{m \in E_{\alpha\beta}} [s_p^\alpha(m)] \cdot [t_p^\beta(m)] = 1$,

ordered by $q \leq p$ if

- (i) $\Omega_q \supseteq \Omega_p$,
- (j) for all $\alpha \in \Omega_p$, $s_q^\alpha \supseteq s_p^\alpha$ and $t_q^\alpha \supseteq t_p^\alpha$,
- (k) for all $\alpha < \beta$ in Ω_p , for all $m \in g(n_q) \setminus g(n_p)$, $[s_q^\alpha(m)] \leq [s_q^\beta(m)]$ and $[t_q^\alpha(m)] \leq [t_q^\beta(m)]$.

Lemma 6. $\mathcal{Q}$ has precaliber $\aleph_1$ (and in particular has the ccc; in particular, $\mathcal{Q}$ does not collapse ω_1).

Proof. Let $p(\xi)$ ($\xi < \omega_1$) be an uncountable sequence of conditions. Let $X \subseteq \omega_1$ be an uncountable set such that $\{\Omega_{p(\xi)} : \xi \in X\}$ forms a Δ -system, say with root $\Omega < \Omega_{p(\xi)} \setminus \Omega$ of size l , where $|\Omega_{p(\xi)} \setminus \Omega| = l^*$ for all $\xi \in X$. By going to an uncountable subsequence, we may also assume that for all $\xi \in X$,

$$(20) \quad n_{p(\xi)} = n,$$

$$(21) \quad s_{p(\xi)}^\alpha = s^\alpha \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Omega,$$

$$(22) \quad t_{p(\xi)}^\alpha = t^\alpha \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Omega.$$

For each ξ , let $\{\gamma(\xi, 0), \dots, \gamma(\xi, l + l^* - 1)\}$ be the increasing enumeration of $\Omega_{p(\xi)}$. By going to an uncountable subsequence we assume that

$$(23) \quad k_{\gamma(\xi, d)}(i, j) = l_d(i, j) \quad \text{for all } d = 0, \dots, l + l^* - 1, \text{ for all } \xi \in X,$$

$$(24) \quad E_{\gamma(\xi, d)\gamma(\xi, \bar{d})} = D_{d\bar{d}} \quad \text{for all } d \neq \bar{d}, \text{ for all } \xi \in X,$$

where $k_{\gamma(\xi, d)}(i, j) < i$ satisfies the requirement of (e), for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j < 2^i$, for the condition $p(\xi)$, and the sets $E_{\gamma(\xi, d)\gamma(\xi, \bar{d})} \subseteq g(n)$ satisfy the requirements of (h) for the condition $p(\xi)$.

For each $\alpha, \beta \in \omega_1$, let $\varphi_{\alpha\beta} : \omega_1 \rightarrow \omega_1$ be the bijection which swaps $\alpha + n$ with $\beta + n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and fixes all other ordinals. For $s \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Lim}(\omega_1)} \text{Fin}([\alpha, \alpha + \omega), \{0, 1\})$, define $\delta(s) \in \text{Lim}(\omega_1)$ so that $\text{dom}(s) \subseteq [\delta(s), \delta(s) + \omega)$. By going to an uncountable subsequence we can assume that there are sets $F_d \subseteq g(n)$ where

$$(25) \quad \{m < g(n) : \delta(s_{p(\xi)}^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(m)) = \gamma(\xi, d)\} = F_d,$$

for all $d = 0, \dots, l + l^*$, for all $\xi \in X$; and that

$$(26) \quad s_{p(\xi)}^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(m) \circ \varphi_{\gamma(\xi, d)\gamma(\eta, d)} = s_{p(\eta)}^{\gamma(\eta, d)}(m) \quad \text{for all } m \in F_d,$$

for all $d = 0, \dots, l + l^*$, for all $\xi, \eta \in X$.

For each ξ , let $\Gamma_\xi = \{\delta(s_{p(\xi)}^\alpha(m)) : \alpha \in \Omega_{p(\xi)}, m < g(n)\}$ and $\Lambda_\xi = \{\delta(t_{p(\xi)}^\alpha(m)) : \alpha \in \Omega_{p(\xi)}, m < g(n)\}$. By going to an uncountable subsequence we can assume that $\{\Gamma_\xi : \xi \in X\}$ and $\{\Lambda_\xi : \xi \in X\}$ form Δ -systems with roots Γ and Λ , respectively, and that

$$(27) \quad \Gamma_\xi \cap \Lambda_\eta = \Gamma \cap \Lambda \quad \text{for all } \xi \neq \eta.$$

Refining again, we can assume that there are sets $G_d \subseteq g(n)$ where

$$(28) \quad \{m < g(n) : \delta(s_{p(\xi)}^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(m)) \in \Gamma\} = G_d$$

for all d and all ξ , and that

$$(29) \quad s_{p(\xi)}^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(m) = u(d, m) \quad \text{for all } m \in G_d,$$

for all d , for all ξ .

It remains to show that $\{p(\xi) : \xi \in X\}$ is centered, but we can simplify things by just proving that it is linked, because we only need the fact that $\mathcal{Q}$ does not collapse ω_1 . Fix $\xi \neq \eta$ in X . Put $n_q = \max(l + 2l^*, n + 1)$.

By (21) and (22) we can define $s_q^\alpha, t_q^\alpha : g(n_q) \rightarrow \{\langle -1 \rangle\} \cup \bigcup_{\gamma \in \text{Lim}(\alpha+1)} \text{Fin}([\gamma, \gamma + \omega), \{0, 1\})$ so that

$$(30) \quad s_q^\alpha \upharpoonright g(n) = s_{p(\xi)}^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad t_q^\alpha \upharpoonright g(n) = t_{p(\xi)}^\alpha \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Omega_{p(\xi)},$$

$$(31) \quad s_q^\alpha \upharpoonright g(n) = s_{p(\eta)}^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad t_q^\alpha \upharpoonright g(n) = t_{p(\eta)}^\alpha \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Omega_{p(\eta)};$$

for all $i = n + 1, \dots, n_q - 1$, for all $j < 2^i$, for all $k < i$: for all $d = 0, \dots, l - 1$,

$$(32) \quad s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \begin{cases} w(\gamma(\xi, k), i, j), & \text{if } k \leq d, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } k > d, \end{cases}$$

$$(33) \quad t_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \begin{cases} w(\gamma(\xi, k), i, j \vee 2^{i-1}), & \text{if } k \leq d, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } k > d, \end{cases}$$

and for all $d = l, \dots, l + l^* - 1$,

$$(34) \quad s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \begin{cases} w(\gamma(\xi, k), i, j), & \text{if } k \leq d, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } k > d, \end{cases}$$

$$(35) \quad t_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \begin{cases} w(\gamma(\xi, k), i, j \vee 2^{i-1}), & \text{if } k \leq d, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } k > d, \end{cases}$$

$$(36) \quad s_q^{\gamma(\eta, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \begin{cases} w(\gamma(\eta, k), i, j), & \text{if } k \leq d, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } k > d, \end{cases}$$

$$(37) \quad t_q^{\gamma(\eta, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \begin{cases} w(\gamma(\eta, k), i, j \vee 2^{i-1}), & \text{if } k \leq d, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } k > d; \end{cases}$$

and for all $j < 2^{n_q}$ and $k < n_q$: for all $d < l$, $s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle n_q, j, k \rangle)$ and $t_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle n_q, j, k \rangle)$ are as in (32) and (33) with $i = n_q$, and for all $d = l, \dots, l + l^* - 1$,

$$(38) \quad s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle n_q, j, k \rangle) = \begin{cases} w(\gamma(\xi, k), n_q, j), & \text{if } k \leq d, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } d < k < l + l^*, \\ w(\gamma(\xi, k - l^*), n_q, j), & \text{if } l + l^* \leq k \leq d + l^*, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } k > d + l^*, \end{cases}$$

and $t_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle n_q, j, k \rangle)$ is as in (35) (with $i = n_q$), and $s_q^{\gamma(\eta, d)}(\langle n_q, j, k \rangle)$ is as in (36) and

$$(39) \quad t_q^{\gamma(\eta, d)}(\langle n_q, j, k \rangle) = \begin{cases} w(\gamma(\eta, k), n_q, j \vee 2^{n_q-1}), & \text{if } k \leq d, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } d < k < l + l^*, \\ w(\gamma(\eta, k - l^*), n_q, j), & \text{if } l + l^* \leq k \leq d + l^*, \\ \langle -1 \rangle, & \text{if } k > d + l^*. \end{cases}$$

Let us first explain why $q = (\Omega_{p(\xi)} \cup \Omega_{p(\eta)}, \{s_q^\alpha, t_q^\alpha : \alpha \in \Omega_{p(\xi)} \cup \Omega_{p(\eta)}\})$ is a member of $\mathcal{Q}$. Condition (a) is obvious, (b) is clear, and condition (c) is satisfied since $n_q \geq l + 2l^* = |\Omega_q|$. Condition (d) holds because $\mu([w(\alpha, i, j)]) = 2^{-i}$. For all $i = n + 1, \dots, n_q$, for all $j < 2^i$: $d < i$ for all $d = 0, \dots, l + l^* - 1$ by condition (c) for $p(\xi)$, and $s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, d \rangle) = w(\gamma(\xi, d), i, j)$ and $t_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, d \rangle) = w(\gamma(\xi, d), i, j \vee 2^{i-1})$ witnessing condition (e) for $\gamma(\xi, d)$; similarly for $\gamma(\eta, d)$.

Observe that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega_{p(\xi)}$, for all $i = n+1, \dots, n_q$, either $s^\alpha(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = w(\gamma(\xi, k), i, j)$ and $t^\beta(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = w(\gamma(\xi, k), i, j \vee 2^{i-1})$, or else at least one of $s^\alpha(\langle i, j, k \rangle)$ and $t^\beta(\langle i, j, k \rangle)$ is $\langle -1 \rangle$; and similarly for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega_{p(\eta)}$. First of all, taking $\alpha = \beta$ this shows that condition (f) is satisfied by q . It also shows that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega_{p(\xi)}$, for all $i = n+1, \dots, n_q$ and all j, k , $[s_q^\alpha(\langle i, j, k \rangle)] \cdot [t_q^\beta(\langle i, j, k \rangle)] = 0$; and similarly for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega_{p(\eta)}$; we also see that for all $\alpha \in \Omega_{p(\xi)}$ and $\beta \in \Omega_{p(\eta)}$, either $[s_q^\alpha(\langle i, j, k \rangle)] \cdot [t_q^\beta(\langle i, j, k \rangle)]$ is of the form $[w(\zeta, i, j)] \cdot [w(\gamma, i, j')]$ for some $\zeta \neq \gamma$ in $\text{Lim}(\omega_1)$, which has measure 2^{-2i} by stochastic independence, or it is equal to 0; similarly for $\alpha \in \Omega_{p(\eta)}$ and $\beta \in \Omega_{p(\xi)}$. Hence to verify (g) it remains to consider the pairs $(\gamma(\xi, d), \gamma(\eta, \bar{d}))$ and $(\gamma(\eta, d), \gamma(\xi, \bar{d}))$ for $d, \bar{d} = l, \dots, l+l^*-1$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. If $\delta(s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle)) = \delta(t_q^{\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})}(\langle i, j, k \rangle))$ then $\langle i, j, k \rangle \in G_d$ by (27), and hence by (29), $s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = u(d, \langle i, j, k \rangle) = s_q^{\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})}(\langle i, j, k \rangle)$ and thus $\mu([s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle)] \cdot [t_q^{\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})}(\langle i, j, k \rangle)]) \leq 2^{-2i}$ by condition (g) for $p(\eta)$; otherwise, when $\delta(s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(\langle i, j, k \rangle)) \neq \delta(t_q^{\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})}(\langle i, j, k \rangle))$ condition (g) holds by stochastic independence and the condition (d) for $p(\xi)$ and $p(\eta)$.

For condition (h) we only need to look at $\{\alpha, \beta\} \not\subseteq \Omega_{p(\xi)}, \Omega_{p(\eta)}$; hence, fixing $d, \bar{d} = l, l+1, \dots, l+l^*-1$ we need to consider $\gamma(\xi, d)$ and $\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})$. First suppose $d \neq \bar{d}$. Note that $D_{d\bar{d}} \subseteq F_d$ by condition (hi). Let Φ be the automorphism on $\mathcal{R}_{(\omega_1)}$ induced by $\varphi_{\gamma(\xi, d)\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})}$. Then by conditions (hi), (hii) and (26),

$$(40) \quad [s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(m)] \cdot [t_q^{\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})}(m)] = \Phi([s_{p(\eta)}^{\gamma(\eta, d)}(m)] \cdot [t_{p(\eta)}^{\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})}(m)]) \quad \text{for all } m \in D_{d\bar{d}}.$$

Thus $\sum_{m \in D_{d\bar{d}}} [s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(m)] \cdot [t_q^{\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})}(m)] = \Phi(\sum_{m \in D_{d\bar{d}}} [s_{p(\eta)}^{\gamma(\eta, d)}(m)] \cdot [t_{p(\eta)}^{\gamma(\eta, \bar{d})}(m)]) = \Phi(1) = 1$, as required. Otherwise, when $d = \bar{d}$, put

$$(41) \quad H_d = \{\langle i, j, l_d(i, j) \rangle : i = 1, \dots, n, j < 2^i\} \\ \cup \{\langle i, j, d \rangle : i = n+1, \dots, n_q, j < 2^i\},$$

$$(42) \quad I_d = \{\langle n_q, j, d+l^* \rangle : j < 2^{n_q}\}.$$

Then $\{[s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(m)] \cdot [t_q^{\gamma(\eta, d)}(m)] : m \in H_d\} = \{[w(\gamma(\xi, d), i, j)] \cdot [w(\gamma(\eta, d), i, j)] : i = 1, \dots, n_q, j < 2^i\}$ and $\{[s_q^{\gamma(\xi, d)}(m)] \cdot [t_q^{\gamma(\eta, d)}(m)] : m \in I_d\} = \{[w(\gamma(\xi, d), n_q, j)] \cdot [w(\gamma(\eta, d), n_q, j)] : j < 2^{n_q}\}$, and therefore $H_d \cup I_d$ satisfies (h) for q by (18); similarly, for the opposite pair.

It should be clear now that in fact $q \leq p$, concluding the proof. $\square$

Now for a filter $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$, define

$$(43) \quad s^\alpha = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{G}} s_p^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad t^\alpha = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{G}} t_p^\alpha.$$

For a sufficiently generic $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$, a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 6 shows that for each α , $s^\alpha, t^\alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Fin}(\alpha + \omega, \{0, 1\}) \cup \{\langle -1 \rangle\}$. Define $\mathcal{R}_{(\omega_1)}$ -names $(\dot{a}_\alpha, \dot{b}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ by

$$(44) \quad \|m \in \dot{a}_\alpha\| = [s^\alpha(m)],$$

$$(45) \quad \|m \in \dot{b}_\alpha\| = [t^\alpha(m)],$$

for all m . Condition (k) ensures that $\dot{a}_\alpha$ and $\dot{b}_\alpha$ are increasing with respect to α modulo Fin . By (f), $\|\dot{a}_\alpha \cap \dot{b}_\alpha = \emptyset\| = 1$ for all α establishing (15). For all $\alpha \neq \beta$, by (h), $\|\dot{a}_\alpha \cap \dot{b}_\beta \neq \emptyset\| = 1$ establishing (16). And (g) establishes (17). This completes the proof that the object described in (15)–(17) is consistent, and thus completes the proof of the Theorem.

REFERENCES

- [AT97] Uri Abraham and Stevo Todorćević, *Partition properties of ω_1 compatible with CH*, Fund. Math. **152** (1997), no. 2, 165–181.
- [Dow95] Alan Dow, *More set-theory for topologists*, Topology Appl. **64** (1995), no. 3, 243–300.
- [Fre01] David H. Fremlin, *Measure algebras*, vol. 3, Torres Fremlin, 2001, <http://www.essex.ac.uk/maths/staff/fremlin/mtsales.htm>.
- [Gil36] J. Gillis, *Note on a property of measurable sets*, J. London Math. Soc. **11** (1936), 139–141.
- [GS01] Moti Gitik and Saharon Shelah, *More on real-valued measurable cardinals and forcing with ideals*, Israel J. Math. **124** (2001), 221–242.
- [Had94] Jacques Hadamard, *Sur les caracteres de convergence des series a termes positifs et sur les fonctions indefiniment croissantes*, Acta Math. **18** (1894), 319–336.
- [Hau36] F. Hausdorff, *Summen $\aleph_1$ von Mengen*, Fund. Math. **26** (1936), 241–255.
- [Hir01] James Hirschorn, *Summable gaps*, to appear in Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 2001.
- [Kei70] H. Jerome Keisler, *Logic with the quantifier “there exist uncountably many”*, Ann. Math. Logic **1** (1970), 1–93.
- [Kun76] Kenneth Kunen, *(κ, λ^*) gaps under MA*, handwritten note, August 1976.
- [Sch93] Marion Scheepers, *Gaps in ω^ω* , Set theory of the reals (Ramat Gan, 1991), Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1993, pp. 439–561.
- [Sch96] ———, *The Boise problem book*, Topology Atlas Preprint #167, 1996.
- [TF95] Stevo Todorćević and Ilijas Farah, *Some applications of the method of forcing*, Yenisei, Moscow, 1995.

INSTITUT FÜR FORMALE LOGIK, UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, AUSTRIA

E-mail address: James.Hirschorn@logic.univie.ac.at

URL: <http://www.logic.univie.ac.at/~hirschor/>